

Remarks

A. Claims

No claims have been amended. Claims 40-41 have been added. Claims 1-41 are currently pending.

B. 35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-6, 9-15, 18-27, 37, and 39 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lach (U.S. Patent No. 6,363,452) (hereinafter “Lach”) in view of Ledzius, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,539,438) (hereinafter “Ledzius”). Applicant respectfully disagrees with these rejections.

In order to reject a claim as obvious, the Examiner has the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. *In re Warner* et al., 379 F.2d 1011, 154 U.S.P.Q. 173, 177-178 (C.C.P.A. 1967). To establish a *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (C.C.P.A. 1974), MPEP § 2143.03.

Neither Lach nor Ledzius appear to disclose, teach, or suggest “wherein the removable function module is operable to provide additional functionality to each of the computer cards comprised in the slots of the cage (emphasis added)” as recited in claims 1 and 11. The Examiner points to Lach at column 5, lines 14-52 for this teaching. However, Lach teaches “adapter cards” for the motherboard. Lach does not appear to teach a removeable function module to provide additional functionality to each computer card. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the rejection to claims 1, 11, and claims dependent thereon.

Similarly, Lach and Ledzius do not appear to disclose, teach, or suggest “wherein the first removable function module provides a first additional functionality to each of the

at least a subset of the plurality of computer cards comprised in the slots of the cage” as recited in claim 21. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the rejection to claim 21 and claims dependent thereon.

Furthermore, Lach and Ledzius do not appear to disclose, teach, or suggest “wherein the first removable function module provides a first additional functionality to each of the computer cards comprised in the slots of the cage” as recited in claim 31. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the rejection to claim 31 and claims dependent thereon.

Lach and Ledzius also do not appear to disclose, teach, or suggest “wherein the removeable function module is capable of interacting with each of the at least two computer cards to add functionality to each of the at least two computer cards” as recited in claim 37. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the rejection to claim 37 and claims dependent thereon.

The Examiner has rejected claims 7, 16, 28, 29, 34, and 38 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lach in view of Ledzius and further in view of Heath, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,564,274) (hereinafter “Heath”). Applicant respectfully disagrees with these rejections. Applicant respectfully asserts claims 7, 16, 28, 29, 34, and 38 are allowable at least as dependent on patentably distinct claims 1, 11, 21, 31, and 37.

The Examiner has rejected claims 8, 17, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lach. Applicant respectfully disagrees with these rejections. Applicant respectfully asserts claims 8, 17, and 25 are allowable at least as dependent on patentably distinct claims 1, 11, and 21.

C. Many Of The Dependent Claims Are Separately Patentable

The Examiner is also respectfully requested to separately consider each of the dependent claims for patentability. Many of the dependent claims in addition to those mentioned above are independently patentable.

For example, the cited art does not appear to disclose, teach, or suggest “wherein the plurality of computing systems comprises a plurality of independent computing systems (emphasis added)” as recited in claim 9. The Examiner points to Lach at column 5, lines 14-32 for this teaching. However, the adapter cards taught by Lach are not independent. For example, the adapter cards do not appear to function apart from the motherboard. Applicant asserts claim 9 is also allowable for at least the above reason.

Furthermore, the cited art does not appear to disclose, teach, or suggest “a power supply comprised on the frame, wherein the power supply is operable to couple to an external power source and supply power to the plurality of computing systems” as recited in claim 10. The Examiner points to Lach column 7, lines 53-64. However, Lach does not appear to disclose a power supply comprised on the frame as recited by claim 10. Instead, Lach appears to disclose a power supply as part of the computer system connected to an adapter card. Applicant asserts claim 10 is also allowable for at least the above reason.

D. New Claims

New claims 40-41 are also believed allowable. The cited art does not appear to disclose, teach, or suggest “wherein the computer card contains a personal computer.” as recited in claim 40. For example, Ledzius teaches PCMCIA cards, not personal computers comprised on a card. PCMCIA cards do not contain the functionality of a personal computer. In addition, the cited art does not appear to disclose, teach, or suggest “wherein each personal computer comprised on each of the plurality of computer cards interfaces with a separate set of human interface devices, including at least a monitor and

a keyboard, to provide personal computer functionality to a user of the separate set of human interface devices” as recited in claim 41.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any extensions of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) are necessary to prevent the above referenced application(s) from becoming abandoned, Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extensions. If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel PC Deposit Account No. 50-1505/5602-09400/JCH.

Also enclosed herewith are the following items:

- ☒ Request for Continued Examination
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement
- ☒ Return Receipt Postcard

Respectfully submitted,



Jeffrey C. Hood
Reg. No. 35,198
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel PC
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8800

Date: 4/2/2004